

**REMARKS**

Claims 3-25 are pending.

I. **Specification Objection**

The specification, as amendment by the Amendment of February 6, 2003, stands objected to under 35 USC § 132 as allegedly introducing new matter into the specification. In particular, the Office Action identifies the passage “Such glue may be applied during the manufacture of the groove and/or tenon. When the glue is applied during manufacture, it is preferably activated before the tenon is joined with the groove to form the joint of the invention” as not being supported by the originally filed specification.

In response, Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to Section I of the Amendment of February 6, 2003, which states that the specification has also been amended to include subject matter recited by the originally filed claims, but not included in the text of the specification. Accordingly, Applicants additionally direct the Examiner’s attention to originally filed claims 2 and 3 which state:

“2. A guiding means according to claim 1, wherein the glue is applied during the manufacturing process.

3. A process according to claim 2, wherein the glue is activated before joining the tenon with the groove” (emphasis added)

Thus, as claims are considered part of the original disclosure, amendment of the specification to include such recitation does not introduce new matter into the application, and the objected to paragraph is, therefore, completely supported by the originally filed claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the objected to paragraph does not constitute new matter under 35 USC § 132. As such, no substitute specification is being provided.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Nelson

Claims 3-25 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by, or under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over, Nelson (U.S. Patent No. 5,618,6020). In light of the above-amendments, reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Specifically, while Nelson may show a distal angled section on the tenon, such angled section of Nelson, at the distal end of the tenon, cannot be the equivalent of the claimed guiding wedge. In contrast, the claims as amended recite that the guiding wedge is positioned between the distal end of the tenon and the core.

Additionally, while Nelson's beveled surface 30 may be considered a wedge, such beveled surface 30 is not a guiding wedge in accordance with the present claims. As recited by claim 17, the "tenon has an angled distal surface and at least one of said guiding wedges is positioned between said angled distal surface and the core . . . and said at least one guiding wedge comprises a distal angled surface and a section extending from said distal angled surface of said guiding wedge to said core." Thus, claim 17 describes the tenon as having a distal angled surface, and the guiding wedge also having a distal angled surface, wherein the distal angled surface of the guiding wedge is between the distal end of the tenon and said core. At best, Nelson teaches only a single structure which can arguably be considered a "wedge," i.e., beveled surface 30, which neither teaches, nor suggests, the claimed invention.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all objections and rejections are overcome. If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas P. Pavelko  
Registration No. 31,689

TPP/EPR/mat  
Attorney Docket No.: TPP 30887CIP2

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.  
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850  
Washington, D.C. 20005-2477  
Telephone: (202) 785-0100  
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088

Date: April 30, 2004